





THE  
AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY,  
BOSTON.

---

BOSTON:  
PUBLISHED BY THE MASS. A. S. SOCIETY.  
1859.



# THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY,

B O S T O N .

---

The *Independent* copies from the *Vermont Chronicle*, and proposes to enlarge by subsequent additions, a list of Ministerial and Ecclesiastical bodies other than local churches, which have passed resolutions either explicitly condemning the present position of the American Tract Society in New York, or, in view of that position, recommending the churches to withhold their contributions from the Society in New York, and transfer them to the Society at Boston. Of the thirty bodies which are asserted to have taken this position, thirteen are 'larger bodies, generally representing States,' and the remainder 'Ministerial Associations, or County, or District Conferences of churches.' Six of the bodies in question 'indicate their dissent from the New York Society by express approval of the *different* action of the Society at Boston.'

The *Independent* presents these statistics in a triumphant strain, as if this transfer of allegiance from the National Society in New York to its auxiliary in Boston were a decided advantage to the cause of

freedom ; as if the auxiliary occupied ground materially different from its principal, and as if that difference were a great gain in regard to the treatment of slavery. We propose to look for a moment at each of these points.

I. What is, precisely, the difference between these two bodies ? We shall present it from their two Annual Reports, presented last May, and published in June, which now lie before us.

Every one knows that, during the year preceding that Report, the Executive Committee of the National Society in New York had refused to publish any tract naming, or even referring to, the subject of slavery. Since that course had been complained of as inconsistent with a vote passed at the previous annual meeting, the Executive Committee presented a vindication of it, stating, at length, the reasons why they supposed the Society would wish them to take exactly that course, under the circumstances. This document occupies from p. 180 to p. 199 of the Report, and is signed by the Publishing Committee, (including South-side Adams,) the Distributing Committee and the Finance Committee, sixteen persons.

The test question before the Society then was the censure or approval of this course of the Executive Committee.

‘The following resolution was offered, and supported in an able address by Bishop McIlvaine :

‘Resolved, That the action of the Executive Committee as reported be APPROVED.

‘A protracted debate ensued. \* \* The debate was continued till three o’clock, when, various substitutes and amendments having been rejected, Bishop McIlvaine’s resolution was *adopted* by a vote of *the great majority* of the members and directors present.’—p. 4.

Immediately after this, and confirming it in the strongest manner as the will of the Society, the whole board of officers was reflected.

We now come to the Annual Report of the Tract Society at Boston, which has been an Auxiliary of the New York Society since 1825.

Their first resolution is a direction to the Executive Committee to ‘*report next year*’ respecting the ‘expediency of dissolving the connection between this Society and the National Society of New York.’ Thus, for the present, the latter remains Principal, and the former Auxiliary.

Their second resolution declares their readiness to receive funds from all sections of the country, and their determination to disburse them ‘by their own officers and agents.’

In resolution third, they express the intention of obtaining books and tracts from other sources, as well as from the issues of the National Society, stating as the reason of this change their belief that such ‘can be obtained and sold at as cheap or *cheaper rates*.’

The fourth resolution, a very important one for the full understanding of the position of the Boston Society, is as follows:—

‘Resolved, That we entertain the highest respect

for the wisdom, judgment and sincerity of the Special Committee of fifteen, appointed by the American Tract Society of New York, at the annual meeting held in 1856, and *heartily adopt the resolutions reported by them, and declare our purpose to carry into effect the principles embraced in those resolutions.*'—p. 2.

Since the Boston Society thus found themselves upon the 'principles' embraced in the Report of the Special Committee of Fifteen, it is essential to one who would understand the Boston Society, to have in mind the history and the substance of that Report. We regard the following points in relation to it as important:—

1. The Special Committee, or 'Committee of Investigation,' was appointed at the suggestion of the Executive Committee of the Tract Society, and selected by the President, a man who fully sympathized with the past policy of the Society. Of course, a majority of the Committee thus selected were favorers of that past policy.

2. Since neither party in the Committee would abandon its claim, and allow the Report unequivocally to favor the views of the other, they compromised by allowing the wishes of each to be expressed in alternating sentences, one set being obviously intended to require, and the other to forbid, publications by the Society on the subject of slavery. This gave to the Report that two-faced character which Dr. Joseph P. Thompson appropriately called its *positive* side and its *negative* side. This distinction will be easily seen



if we separate these portions of the Report, giving each in its own column, as follows:—

## NEGATIVE.

‘2. That this Society cannot therefore with propriety allow itself to be made a *special* organ of any one system of religious or moral reform, such as temperance, peace, anti-popery, *anti-slavery*, etc.; while *within its proper sphere*, .....

## POSITIVE.

its influence should sustain the cause of truth and righteousness in *all their departments*.

‘3. That in endeavoring to accomplish its high and holy mission, the Society should deal even-handedly, and bear impartial testimony against *all* fundamental doctrinal error and practical immorality, *prevailing in any and every part of our country*.

‘4. That in the judgment of your Committee, the *political* aspects of slavery lie entirely without the proper sphere of this Society, and cannot be discussed in its publications; .....

but that those moral duties which grow out of

## NEGATIVE.

in a *fraternal* and Christian spirit.

‘8. That we cordially recognize the *fidelity* and devotedness with which the interests of the Society have been superintended and conducted by the officers and Executive Committee, five of the present members having been among its original founders.

‘9. That with great confidence in the *wisdom* of the Executive Committee, we anticipate that their action . . . . .

will be such as will tend to promote the *widest and best* usefulness of the Society *throughout our whole country.*’

## POSITIVE.

the existence of slavery, as well as those moral evils and vices which it is known to promote, and which are condemned in Scripture, and so much deplored by evangelical Christians, *undoubtedly do* fall within the province of this Society, *and can and ought to be discussed*

in carrying out the principles contained in the previous resolutions, . . .

This document is signed by Theodore Frelinghuysen and thirteen others. As the representatives of both parties in the Committee united in presenting it, so the parties themselves, in the Annual Meeting, united in accepting it, and Dr. Thompson, of the *Independent*, volunteered the expression of his entire approval of 'both its positive and its negative side.'

Of course, since these two sides had opposite bearings, one favoring the publication of matter in regard to slavery and the other opposing it, although both might be accepted on paper, (by any party which chose so to stultify itself,) they could not possibly be united in practice. In fact, nobody ever expected them to be united in practice; each party expected to gain the victory, and each intended, on gaining it, to ignore the set of expressions forced into the Report by the other party, and administer the affairs of the Society in accordance with the *shibboleth* of its own. Possession proved to be nine points of the law. The government was sustained by a large majority of the Society, and the *negative* side of the Special Committee's Report was construed as the *animus*, the true intent and meaning of that document, as every partisan of that side in the Special Committee had intended it should be.

3. As soon as the remonstrants had lost the victory, it plainly appeared how hollow had been the truce between the two parties. The *Independent*, the obvious leader of the opposition, which had of course intended, if successful, to play the same trick on the other side—to ignore the 'negative' phrases in the

Report—to consider its *animus*, its true intent and meaning, to lie in the clause ‘CAN AND OUGHT TO BE DISCUSSED’—and to treat with very slight regard the opposing clauses which were (and still are) mainly relied upon by the New York ‘management’—the *Independent* lost its temper, charged the men whose ‘FIDELITY’ and whose ‘WISDOM’ it had just joined in eulogizing, with all manner of unfairness and dishonesty, and railed against the obvious majority which had defeated it, as if duty had required them to give place to a minority.

The remonstrants, or favorers of the ‘positive’ side of the Special Committee’s Report, seeing that they were out-manceuvred by the government, and that the Society also had unequivocally declared itself against them, directed their efforts to obtain the control of the most important of its auxiliaries, the Tract Society at Boston. They succeeded in accomplishing this at the very next annual meeting, in May of the present year. What use they made of this success, and how far they chose to make it efficacious against slavery, we are now ready to inquire.

We have expressed the opinion that Dr. Thompson and the remonstrants had intended to play the same trick, had they triumphed in the New York Society, which greater numbers and more skilful management enabled their dear brethren on the other side to play upon them; namely, accepting the whole of the two-faced Report of the Special Committee, to make *their* face the operative and practical one, and let the other pass unregarded. While this was merely our opin-

ion, many would undoubtedly call it uncharitable and unjust. We shall now proceed to show that this was the very course taken by the remonstrants, as soon as they found themselves a majority in the Boston Society.

If the reader will look back at the fourth resolution (above quoted in full) passed by the Boston Society last May, he will see that they adopted the two-faced resolutions of the New York Special Committee, in full, as their platform and basis of operations, as far as slavery is concerned.

Their very next act (p. 4) was to quote and adopt, by another resolution, the most '*positive*' of the expressions of that series which they had already adopted in full, thus giving the key to their intended interpretation of the whole document, making the '*positive*' side prominent and effective, and ignoring the other side as thoroughly as the New York '*management*' were at that very moment ignoring theirs. Here is the Resolution :

'Resolved, That the political aspects of slavery lie entirely without the proper sphere of this Society, and cannot be discussed in its publications : but that those moral duties which grow out of the existence of slavery, as well as those moral evils which it is known to promote, and which are condemned in Scripture, and so much deplored by evangelical Christians, do undoubtedly fall within the province of this Society, and can and ought to be discussed in a fraternal and Christian spirit.'

The Constitutions of the New York and Boston Societies, directing their *general* operations, are substan-

tially the same ; and we now have seen that both have taken *the same document*—the Resolutions of the Special Committee—as *their rule upon the subject of slavery*. It is plain, then, that whatever difference may appear in the operations of these two Societies upon that subject will arise solely from the fact that one interprets that whole document by its ‘negative’ side, the other by its ‘positive’ side.

Having ascertained, by the printed Reports of these two Societies, precisely what is the difference between them on the subject of slavery, we are now prepared to look at the second point proposed, namely :

II. Is that difference such as to make the Boston Society greatly preferable to the other, so that the removal of patronage from the latter to the former may be properly spoken of as a great gain, either to freedom or religion ?

In illustration of this point, we proceed to quote from the Report of the Boston Society for 1858.

In the closing session of the meeting, the following was offered, and adopted without debate :—

‘Resolved, That the Executive Committee be instructed to pay over no money to New York, *except for publications.*’ p. 7.

This shows (what the shelves of the Boston Depository show at this moment) that the Boston Society still proposes to buy and circulate that same New York series of books and tracts, against the emasculation of which some individuals of their number formerly so vehemently protested ; the only change proposed being a few additions from other sources.

The Society then proceeded to re-elect the former board of officers, a board which (with only a few and slight exceptional acts within two or three years) had always acted in perfect harmony with the pro-slavery New York Society, and some of whose members, including the President, had used their influence in that very meeting in favor of the New York Society; they re-elected this board, (except that they diminished the number of the Executive Committee,) retaining upon it even Rev. Baron Stow, whose position in regard to slavery may be judged from the fact that the pew-deeds of his Baptist church in Chauncy street contain a provision forbidding them to be sold to any but a '*respectable white person*'; and they displaced only the Secretary, Rev. Seth Bliss, upon whom they then proceeded to pass a highly eulogistic resolution, making such mention of his '*faithful labors*' as seems to imply both ingratitude and injustice in their ejection of him.

So much we get from the regular 'Forty-fourth Annual Report' of the Boston Society. But in the July following, there was published from the 'Tract House, 28 Cornhill,' an Address from the Executive Committee to the friends of the Society, with the 'Report of the Distribution Committee,' from which we glean some further information.

In this address, after rehearsing that basis of the Boston Society which we have given (partly by abstract and partly by quotation) above, the Executive Committee (including that very Baron Stow whose pew-holders must be '*white*' as well as otherwise

‘respectable’ ) make the following statements; statements which must cause unspeakable amazement at the pretence made by the *Independent*, the *Vermont Chronicle*, the *Congregationalist* and other newspapers, that those who have separated from the New York Society on Anti-Slavery grounds can appropriately give their money and their labor to its auxiliary in Boston :—

‘It may be well to state that the organic relations of this Society to the New York Society *have not been materially changed* by the above resolutions.’ p. 2.

‘This Society may therefore be made the channel for the contributions of all persons, who, for any reason, may prefer our position or our policy to that of the other Society; and we shall feel ourselves at liberty, while *avoiding all attempt at any rival movements*, to send our agents to any church desiring their services. *We invite no separation from that Society*; but, under present circumstances, we believe the greatest amount of good will be done by each Society occupying the whole country as its field.’ p. 3.

‘*We are not an Anti-Slavery Society*, but simply a Religious Tract Society.’ *ib.*

‘We earnestly entreat the churches of our Lord Jesus Christ no longer to permit this important enterprise to decline, because of diverse views on the various questions arising out of the slave system; the time and occasion for that having passed, as *two Societies now offer their facilities for conveying the Gospel of Christ*, in this form, to those who so much need to receive that Gospel. *Let each disciple of Christ choose his channel*, and then employ it. We are not rival merchants.’ p. 4.

Thus the Executive Committee of the Boston Society fully vouch for the pro-slavery New York Socie-



ty as a representative, equally with themselves, of the Gospel of Christ!—as really engaged in the work of diffusing that Gospel, and as equally worthy with themselves to be chosen as almoner, by any ‘disciple of Christ’ who has money to give for that purpose! No wonder that Baron Stow is disposed to say these things; but with what face can the *Independent* and the *Congregationalist* say them? Do they not prove by this, as in so many other ways, that they are more desirous of peace than of purity?—more earnest to allay agitation than to oppose slavery?

The pamphlet of which we are speaking closes with a ‘Report of the Distribution Committee’ on some matters, respecting which counsel was asked from them by the Executive Committee of the Boston Society. One of these points was, ‘What religious papers this Society should distribute?’

The government of the Boston Society, having been always (with the trifling exceptions above noted) in perfect harmony with the pro-slavery administration at New York, have from the beginning subscribed for, and circulated, a large number of copies of the two newspapers published by the New York Society, the ‘Messenger’ and ‘The Child’s Paper.’ Of the former of these, the Boston Society now distributes 56,000 copies, and of the latter, 63,000. The question then was, in effect, whether the Executive Committee should still continue to give its sanction to the immense influence exercised by this periodical communication between the New York Secretaries and the religious public of New England; an

influence directly tending to produce this most pernicious effect upon the religious character of the hundreds of thousands of children and adults who habitually read these papers—namely; the impression that, however diligently the New York Secretaries and Publishing Committee (including South-side Adams) may have labored to uphold slaveholding as Christian, to prevent all censure of it, and even to refuse the publication of Scripture testimonies against *oppression*, without note or comment, *when circumstances favored the idea that, under the heading ‘oppression,’ they meant to include slavery*—THE PERSONS WHO USE PIOUS LANGUAGE SO FLUENTLY MUST BE TRULY CHRISTIAN MEN! The question was, I say, in effect, whether the Boston Society should aid in extending this impression by continuing the circulation of these papers.

The ‘Distribution Committee,’ the chairman of which is Rev. A. L. Stone of Park St. Church, after considering the question, came to the following conclusion :

‘The Committee would therefore recommend to the Executive Committee *to continue* for the present the distribution of the Messenger and Child’s Paper.’ p.12.

Since then, the Boston Society remains an auxiliary of the New York one—expressly disclaims antagonism to it—vouches for it as a *Christian* instrumentality—recommends to those who are not averse to its proslavery character still to support it—chooses for its own executive functionaries men whose influence has always been in favor of it—buys and circulates its stereotyped stock of mutilated books and tracts—con-

tinues its agency in the distribution (and thus necessarily in the recommendation) of a periodical for Sabbath School children, and another for men and women, made up by the very men who have made the New York Society the bulwark of slavery that it now is—and differs from that Society only in this one particular, that it proposes to add to the stock of publications derived from that source some books and tracts of its own, expressing so much as it wishes to say about slavery—it only remains that we inquire, from its own printed documents, how much this is? and whether what it proposes to say *about* slavery is to be *against* slavery? The evidence afforded by the ‘Address’ above mentioned upon these two points is explicit and thorough.

We have seen that, on the third page of that pamphlet, the Executive Committee say—‘We are not an *Anti-Slavery Society*.’

Of course, this disclaimer is made in view of objections, already made, or anticipated, or both, in regard to the course to be pursued by the Society after the contest of the remonstrants and conservatives in May had resulted in the triumph of the former party. Now nobody had objected, nobody had even for a moment imagined, that this Association for the publication of religious tracts intended to relinquish every other department of their work, and publish, henceforth, only matter in regard to slavery. Nobody had said or thought this; but *many* had expressed the fear, and many more the reproach, that the victorious party in the Boston Society intended not only to recognize

slavery as one proper subject for their animadversion, but to publish tracts *against* it; and thus to wound the feelings, not only of South-side Adams and Baron Stow, but of many dear slaveholding ministers and lay brethren in the South; men who are ranked, by the usage of all the clergy and all the churches, as ‘evangelical Christians.’ It is, of course, to meet *this* objection, that the disclaimer above quoted was made; and its meaning and intent are thus obviously shown to be—We do not mean to publish anything *against* slavery; we do not mean to treat slaveholding *as a sin!*

Having thus pledged themselves not to publish *against* slavery, and yet being distinguished from the National Tract Society at New York—their *sole* distinction from that pro-slavery body—by the pledge that they *will* publish something *about* slavery, it remains for us to inquire—What is to be the amount, and how great the force, or the feebleness, of their suggestions *about* slavery? The answer to this question is plainly contained in that most ‘positive’ of the Resolutions of the Special Committee which we have already quoted, and which they formally adopted a second time, for the sake of giving it special prominence, after having adopted the entire series of which it forms a part. We repeat it here, for greater convenience of examination.

‘Resolved, That the political aspects of slavery lie entirely without the proper sphere of this Society, and cannot be discussed in its publications; but that those moral duties which grow out of the existence of slavery, as well as those moral evils which it is known to promote, and which are condemned in Scripture, and

so much deplored by evangelical Christians, do undoubtedly fall within the province of this Society, and can and ought to be discussed in a fraternal and Christian spirit.' p. 4 of the Annual Report, p. 2 of the Address.

Let us examine this somewhat complex idea.

'Those *moral duties* which grow out of the existence of slavery' !

'Those moral duties which *grow out* of the existence of slavery' !!

Does any moral duty grow out of drunkenness, to the drunkard, except that of immediately turning from it ?

Does any moral duty grow out of adultery, to the adulterer, except that of immediately turning from it ?

Does any moral duty grow out of either of these sins, to those in the community who have *not* committed them, except utter opposition to them, at all times and in all places ?

It is utterly absurd to speak of any moral duty but this *growing out of a sin* !

Therefore the people who voted for the above resolution, alike in the Boston and in the New York Society, necessarily say by it that they *do not* regard slaveholding as sin !

Let us look further.

'Those moral evils which it is known to promote' !

Then slaveholding, though not a sin, (according to the Boston Tract Society,) does *promote* certain *moral evils* ! Is the Society to oppose these ?

Wait a little ! there are yet some qualifying circumstances, and then we come to a very decided and 'positive' expression.

*Such* of those moral evils which slavery is known to promote as are (1) 'condemned in Scripture,' and (2) 'so much deplored by evangelical Christians,' 'no UNDOUBTEDLY fall within the province of this Society.'

Good ! If they do undoubtedly fall within the province of the Society, the Society can oppose them as energetically as things deserve which are at once *known* to be moral evils—and *condemned* in Scripture—and *so much* deplored by evangelical Christians !

Not so fast ! The Boston Society does not say that these things, any more than slavery itself, are to be *opposed* ! Here is what they propose to do with them : 'They can and ought to be DISCUSSED' !

Think of a 'Religious Tract Society,' (Address, p. 3,) doing business to the amount of more than fifty thousand dollars a year, and proposing to enlarge it—occupying New England as its special field, but proposing henceforth to occupy 'the whole country'—establishing and carrying on its operations *to discuss* drunkenness ! *to discuss* adultery ! *to discuss* other things which are *known* to be moral evils, and which are also condemned in Scripture and deplored by evangelical Christians ! If they are *known* to be moral evils, why *discuss* them ? Why not *oppose* them ? If the evangelical Christians in question already *deplore* these moral evils, is it not to be supposed that they have already discussed them, and that they are now prepared to *oppose* them ?

The Boston Society do not think so ! On the contrary, even the proposed *discussion* of moral evils is to be limited by yet other qualifying circumstances.

The discussion is to be in a *fraternal* spirit, and in a *Christian* spirit.

Fraternal to whom? To the slave, sympathizing with his bondage 'as bound with him'? Is there the slightest probability that Rev. Baron Stow, with those members of his 'respectable white' church who have a vote in the Tract Society, had *this* in their minds when they voted? Is there the slightest reason, judging from the two pamphlets in which the Boston Society have given us, first their platform and then their interpretation of it, to suppose that this idea was in the minds of *any* of them? On the contrary, every thing, alike in the platform and the commentary, favors the supposition that the fraternity spoken of was to be exhibited towards the National Tract Society to which they voted to remain auxiliary, and for whose Christian character they so warmly vouched, though it refuses even to discuss matters *connected* with slavery; towards the dear clerical brethren, all over New England, who are waiting to see a more decided position taken by their flocks on the slavery question, before committing themselves and their pulpits to either side of it; towards those eminently pious souls, Drs. South-side Adams and Blagden, with whom every one of the eight ministers on the Board is on terms of perfect 'evangelical' good fellowship; towards those not less dear slave-holding brethren in the South—Rev. Dr. H. V. D. Johns, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Baltimore, who retracted (in the newspapers) his hasty expression in the New York Society, declaring that

he meant to say not ‘the *evil* of slavery’ but ‘the *evils* of slavery’—and brother Robert A. Fair, Esq., of Abbeville, South Carolina, whose address before the Bible Society, representing the Bible as a pro-slavery book, and urging its circulation among the slaves as a means of fortifying slavery, was printed in the Society’s official organ, ‘The Bible Society Record,’ and eulogized by the senior Secretary as an ‘important document’ and an ‘excellent address’; and finally, towards all, North and South, who, not being yet ready to *discuss* slavery, leave it meanwhile to flourish, unopposed!

The significance of the term ‘Christian spirit’ in the last clause of the resolution in question is very plain. ‘Is Christ divided?’ That which the Boston Society aspire to, as a Christian spirit, in their own proceedings, must be the same with that which they have recognized and eulogized as Christian in the New York Society; that is to say, a Christianity which slaveholding church-members at the South and non-slaveholding church-members at the North have in common; a Christianity—God forgive us for such a prostitution of the word, even for the momentary purpose of illustration—which is quite irrespective of slaveholding or opposition to slavery!

We are now prepared to answer the question—Is the difference between the New York and Boston Societies—the fact that one *will not* and that the other *will* ‘fraternally discuss’ certain points more or less remotely connected with the fearful organization of wickedness and cruelty known as American slavery—



such as to make the latter greatly preferable to the former, so that the transfer of patronage in that direction may properly be considered a great gain, either to freedom or religion?

We answer—there is one point gained by such a transfer. The few weak, diluted, milk-and-waterish statements, the feeble ‘fraternal discussions’ in regard to matters connected with slavery, which the Boston Society seem disposed to put in circulation, will reach a class of men and women who are as near entire ignorance upon these subjects as any class in the community, and who are, even less than any other class, accessible to true and thorough teaching on the subject of slavery. We mean the church-members and the tract-distributors. If the tracts in question speak *truly*, in regard even to those outskirts of slavery to which they are to be limited, the classes in question will get a small portion of that information which they refuse to receive from *anti-slavery* tracts, newspapers and agents.

On the other hand—since a gain so small in quantity and so poor in quality as this must be bought by the enormous evil of having this Boston Tract Society accepted as a Christian body, and as a body doing Christian work in regard to slavery, by that portion of the ‘religious’ public which is dissatisfied with the New York Society—since, to get even this wretched specimen of ‘gain,’ the moral sense of the persons thus transferring themselves must be so far misled as to consider the Boston Society as standing in a proper relation, both to the New York one and to slavery, and as truly representing the Christian church and

the demands of the Christian religion in regard to American slaveholding—and since a position like that of the New York Society, in open alliance with slavery, and thus plainly cognizable as anti-Christian and utterly unworthy of support, is far less dangerous to Christian purity than a position which, like that of the Boston Society, without really opposing slavery, talks ‘*about it, and about it*’ in such a manner as to gain the *reputation* of opposing it, and thus allows its members to rest in the delusion that they are doing their duty in regard to it—and since the transfer of men and money from the New York to the Boston Society is plainly regarded, and boasted of, by the *Independent* and its kindred papers, as the attainment, to that extent, of such rest, and an exemption, to that extent, from further ‘agitation’ upon the subject of slavery—it seems clear that such transfer is injurious, alike to the cause of freedom and the cause of religion; even as a resting in the belief that he enjoys perfect health, or in the comfort obtained from slightly palliative measures, is more dangerous to the invalid than such a clear and open recognition of his disease as would demand immediate resort to the means of radical cure.

We repeat it: a resting in the belief that the Boston Society is now established on the right basis in regard to slavery is pernicious in all these ways: it is an acceptance of something false as true; it is a direct, and gross, misleading of the minds of men in regard to the actual truth; and it prevents those active measures which are needed to reveal the truth and expose the falsehood.—C. K. W.



